

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is hereby requested.

Claims 1 to 30 were pending in this application.

Claims 1, 26 to 28, and 30 have been amended to now recite that the information-bearing layer(s) has a thickness of from about 0.001 to about 0.01 micron. Support for this amendment can be found on page 4, paragraph number [0022] of the application, as filed. No new matter has been added.

New claims 31 to 35 have been added. Claim 31 includes the additional feature that the information-bearing layer(s) is a continuous or discontinuous strip having recesses in the shape of negative or reverse-image characters formed therein. Claim 32 depends from claim 31 and includes the additional feature that at least a portion of the information-bearing layer(s) is fully encapsulated. Claim 33 depends from claim 32 and includes the additional feature that the information bearing layer(s) is fully encapsulated. Support for these amendments can be found on page 4, paragraph [0022], page 5, paragraph numbers [0025] to [0030], and FIGS. 1 to 7, of the application, as filed. No new matter has been added. Claims 34 and 35 are similar to claim 1, but employ different transitional phrases. Again, no new matter has been added.

Claims 1 to 35 are currently pending in this application.

The undersigned thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended in granting the telephone interview of Monday, October 16, 2006, during which portions of the present Amendment were discussed.

As requested by way of the First Office Action, Applicant herewith submits the foreign patent document, DE 195 48 528 A and the non-patent literature document, "portals and Tagsa make their mark in secure labels" by Richard Tucker. Applicant understands that the PTOL-1449 with initials and date will be sent to the undersigned once these documents are reviewed by the Examiner.

In regard to the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 9 to 15 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,941,687 to Crane, Applicant submits that this ground for rejection is untenable and should be withdrawn. Nothing in Crane teaches or even remotely suggests the durable security device and security article of claims 1, 3, 4, 9 to 15 and 28, as amended.

The present invention, as amended, relates to durable security devices such as security threads that are resistant to chemical attack and mechanical degradation and to security articles such as banknotes that employ such devices. The durable security device of the present invention comprises at least one support layer, at least one information-bearing layer having a thickness ranging from about 0.001 to about 0.01 microns that is disposed on a central band or strip of the support layer surface, and at least one protective layer that is disposed on the information-bearing layer(s) and on the opposing longitudinal borders of the support layer surface.

US 4,941,687 to Crane fails to disclose, and in fact teaches away from a durable security device having an information-bearing layer(s) with a thickness ranging from about 0.001 to about 0.01 microns (10 – 100 angstroms).

US 4,941,687 to Crane also fails to teach or suggest a durable security device having, among other things, a protective layer with a thickness of from about 1 to about 12 microns.

Instead, this reference discloses a security paper having a plastic strip or security thread embedded therein, the security thread containing metallized characters (*e.g.*, aluminum characters)<sup>1</sup> that are sandwiched between pigmented resin (*i.e.*, pigmented resin is located on both sides of the metallized characters). See col. 1, lines 63 to 68, of US 4,941,687. The pigmented resin prevents detection of the security thread when viewed from both sides of the paper under reflected light. The security thread is readily visible, however, when viewed with

---

<sup>1</sup> The metallized or aluminum characters of this reference appear to be positive-text characters and not negative or reverse-image characters. This reference refers to the "metal characters" in U.S. Patent Nos. 4,652,015 and 4,761,205, noting that both surfaces of these metal characters are discernable under reflected light when the metal characters are embedded in a security paper. The "metal characters" shown and described in these references are positive-text metal characters. US 4,941,687 to Crane solves this problem by sandwiching these metal or metallized characters between pigmented resin.

transmitted light from either side of the paper. See col. 1, line 63 to col. 2, line 2, of US 4,941,687.

For ideal opacity, this reference teaches that the aluminum layer should be in excess of 300 angstroms (0.03 microns) in thickness. See col. 2, lines 42 to 43, of US 4,941,687.

Where Crane fails to teach (and in fact teaches away from) an information-bearing layer(s) having a thickness of from about 0.001 to about 0.01 micron (10 – 100 angstroms), it cannot serve to anticipate (nor render obvious) the durable security device and security article of claims 1, 3, 4, 9 to 15 and 28, as amended. Applicant therefore requests that this ground for rejection be withdrawn.

In regard to the rejection of claims 1 to 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,941,687 to Crane in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,388,862 to Edwards, Applicant submits that this ground for rejection is in error and should be withdrawn. Nothing in Crane, taken alone or in combination with Edwards, teaches or even remotely suggests the durable security device and security article of claims 1 to 30, as amended.

According to the Examiner, “one skilled in the art would choose a desired film thickness for the protective layer and to use adhesive for bonding the support and protective layers together because discovering of these are just a matter of routine practice. Regarding to having more than one information bearing layer and their characteristics, the examiner takes the position that this feature is just a matter of design choice”.

Applicant respectfully disagrees and takes the position that there is no *prima facie* case of obviousness for the present claims 1 to 30 over Crane in view of Edwards.

The earlier discussion of Crane is incorporated herein by reference.

The deficiencies of Crane are not overcome by Edwards, which is also deficient.

U.S. Patent No. 5,388,862 to Edwards discloses a security element that comprises a light-transmitting support layer and two or more series of opaque regions which are separated by at least one light transmitting layer. The opaque regions are arranged such that at certain

parts of the security element the regions overlap to prevent light transmission; while at other parts of the security element the opaque regions do not overlap or partially overlap such that light transmission through the security element can occur. (See col. 2, lines 7 to 22, of U.S. Patent No. 5,388,862).

The opaque regions may be in a bar pattern as shown in FIGS. 2 and 3, or in the alternative pattern shown in FIG. 4. (See col. 5, lines 32 to 41, of U.S. Patent No. 5,388,862).

This reference fails to teach or suggest, among other things, the thickness of the protective layer, the thickness of the opaque pattern, and opaque patterns other than the bar and line patterns shown in FIGS. 2 to 4. Moreover, the modifications or combinations being proposed by the Examiner would fall short of yielding the claimed invention where claims 1, 26, 27, 28, 30, as amended, now specify that the information-bearing layer(s) has a thickness of from about 0.001 to about 0.01 micron (10 – 100 angstroms).

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant submits that Crane, alone or in combination with Edwards, fails to teach or render obvious the durable security device and security article of claims 1 to 30, as amended. Applicant therefore requests that this ground for rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant further submits that new claims 31 to 35 are patentable over the art of record.

Early reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the above amendments and remarks is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,



Mary R. Bonzagni  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 34779  
Customer No. 27804  
(413) 567-2076

Date: November 1, 2006

[02044P27b]